

REMARKS

Claims 122-144 remain pending in the present application. The claims have not been amended in response to this Office Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 124-144 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartlett, et al. '510, who shows a table saw with most of the recited limitations including 1st and 2nd stationary rails (34, 36), 1st and 2nd movable rails (58, 60) and a fence (146) that is movable beyond the end of the stationary rails as seen in figure 8.

The Applicants agree with the Examiner in that the fence of the present invention has a wider range of motion than does Bartlett, et al. However, the Applicants disagree with the Examiner where the Examiner states that this feature is not currently claims.

The fence of the present invention is movable from a position where it is between the two ends of the stationary rail to a position where it is beyond one end of the stationary rail. Claim 124, line 4 defines that the stationary rail has a first and a second end. Claim 124, line 12 defines the fence as being connected to the first and second movable rails. Claim 124, lines 19-24 define that movement of said first movable rail with respect to said first stationary rail and movement of said second movable rail with respect to said second stationary rail between a first position where said fence is located between said first and second ends (of the stationary rail) and a second position where said fence is located beyond one of said first and second ends (of the stationary rail) are maintained in a synchronized manner due to said first and second cables.

Thus, Applicants believe that the wider range of motion for the present invention is defined by the claims as currently pending. Regarding Applicants' earlier remarks, it appears that the statement "beyond the end of the table" should have been "between the ends of the stationary rail".

Bartlett, et al. discloses a fence which can be located beyond the ends of the stationary rail but Bartlett's fence cannot be located between the ends of the stationary rail while being connected to the movable rail. Both Jean and Waters disclose the pulley system but do not disclose a fence having the wide range of motion that is defined by the present invention. Thus, Bartlett, et al. taken alone or in combination with Jean and Waters does not render the present invention obvious.

Thus, Applicants believe Claim 124, as currently pending, patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 125-144, which ultimately depend from Claim 124, are also believed to patentably distinguish over the art of record.

Recon

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 11, 2005

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg